

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 DAVID D. DELAY,

13 Defendant.


NO. CR15-175RSL

ORDER GRANTING DISCLOSURE
OF MARYSA COMER'S
VIOLATION REPORTS

14 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion Directing U.S. Probation to
15 Disclose Marysa Comer's Violation Reports," Dkt. # 266, and the Court's subsequent "Order
16 Directing U.S. Probation to Disclose Marysa Comer's Violation Reports," Dkt. # 300. Pursuant
17 to the Court's order, the United States Probation Office provided the Court with copies of all
18 bond violation reports regarding Ms. Comer and pertaining to the above-referenced cause
19 number for the Court's *in camera* review. Having reviewed the reports for probative, relevant,
20 and material information bearing on Ms. Comer's credibility, see United States v. Alvarez, 358
21 F.3d 1194, 1209 (9th Cir. 2004), the Court concludes that all reports should be disclosed to the
22 defense (though not to defendant himself). Without commenting on whether the reports contain
23 impeachment evidence, under the totality of the circumstances the Court finds that the
24 requirements of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S.
25 150 (1972) are best served by disclosure of the reports in full.
26
27

1 The Court will contact the parties to arrange for transmission of the reports.

2
3 DATED this 11th day of April, 2017.

4
5 

6 Robert S. Lasnik
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27